BETF Cost estimates

Cost estimates by program for 2007-08 SY	Curre	nt Funding Level Est.	Lec	gislative Proposal	(+/-)	Full	Funding Coalition* (+/-)	Berge	son/OSPI Proposal	(+/-)		Chair Grimm	(+/-)
General Apportionment	\$	4,442,650,821	\$	6,982,998,222	57%	\$	8,827,246,794	\$	6,753,307,953	52%	\$	6,675,217,439	519
Compensation - CIS	•	2,820,344,573	80.50	4,289,234,525			4,959,217,294		3,801,358,739			3,757,358,739	
Compensation - Classified		207,853,301		174,235,924			313,242,322		215,052,241			215,052,241	
Compensation - Administrator		600,392,069		604,708,402			1,207,452,798		1,120,669,211			1,120,669,211	
LID days		28,957,503		329,871,154			396,653,965		225,545,665			225,545,665	
NERC		487,316,487		1,088,810,658			1,950,680,415		1,390,682,098			1,356,591,584	
Central Office Administration Overhead		297,790,463		496,137,560				12				-	000
Special Education	\$	545,817,090	\$	825,873,531	51%	\$	926,108,325	\$	725,228,008	33%		721,676,761	329
Levy Equalization	\$	202,222,086	\$	369,756,455	83%	\$	303,454,713	\$	285,973,605	41%	\$	285,973,605	419
Assistance to Struggling Students	\$	92,701,694	\$	359,688,184	288%	\$	680,426,081	\$	394,852,108	326%	\$	394,852,108	
Assistance for English Language Learners	\$	65,320,000	\$	144,583,538	121%	\$	218,080,929	\$	246,321,206	277%	\$	246,321,206	2779
Compensation Bonuses	\$		\$			\$		\$	<u>=</u>	0%	\$) ** 1	
Extended Opportunities for Highly Capable	\$	8,396,000	\$	50,773,910	505%	\$		\$	8,684,946	3%	\$	8,684,946	
Transportation (not modeled)	\$	262,728,000	\$	262,728,000	0%	\$	262,728,000	\$	262,728,000	0%	\$	262,728,000	. 09
Institutional Education (not modeled)	\$	18,301,000	\$	18,301,000	0%	\$	18,301,000	\$	18,301,000	0%	\$	18,301,000	09
	\$	5,638,136,692	\$	9,014,702,840	60%	\$	11,236,345,843	\$	8,695,396,827	54%	\$	8,657,755,067	54
				growth over NGF-S \$	37%	grow	th over Total Avail Rev's 36%		growth over NGF-S \$	32%	9.30	growth over NGF-S \$	32
estimated cost per pupil	\$	5,649	\$	9,032		\$	11,258	\$	8,712		\$	8,674	

^{*}Full Funding Coalition proposes an educational program to be funded by all available revenues, and is therefore not comparable in terms of estimating the percentage increase in revenues needed to implement. Accordingly, the percentage growth is displayed as a function of total revenues (local, state, some federal) and not Near General Fund-State as with the others.

NOTE: These figures do not yet include compensation adjustments other than for additional LID days. Additionally, they do not adjust teacher FTEs based on adjustments to the length of the teacher workday.

These are draft cost estimates which rely on a number of good faith assumptions reflecting various degrees of subjective judgement. Because the proposals utilize different methodologies, adjustment factors are used to maintain comparability.